UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,577	08/18/2003	Gregory J. Faanes	1376.711US1	3947
	7590 09/11/200 N, LUNDBERG & WO	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2938			THOMAS, SHANE M	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/643,577	FAANES ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SHANE M. THOMAS	2186	

	SHANE M. THOMAS	2186	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment ( <b>I</b>	PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 7.8.14.15.22.24.25 and 29-32.		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>B. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowand	ce because:
12. $\square$ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
	/Shane M Thomas/ Patent Examiner, Art Un	it 2186	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendments to claim 29 change the scope of the claim, which would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but do not place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant argues on page 11 of the present response that the present invention, unlike Hughes, determines whether a memory request is to be added to the FOQ based on the condition of "if the portion of an address associated with the memory request does not match the one or more partial addresses in the FOQ and at the same time, whether the memory request missed the local cache." Because Hughes teaches that all memory requests are transferred to the LS2 buffer (e.g. FOQ) (at least in column 14, lines 20-34, and column 16, lines 61-66), it can therefore be seen that when the situation of "the portion of an address associated with the memory request does not match a partial address in the FOQ, and at the same time, misses in the local cache" arises that the memory request would be added to the FOQ (e.g. since this is just one of a plurality of instances when an entry to the FOQ is added). Applicant appears to be arguing that the only time an entry to the FOQ is added is when the aforementioned conditions are met; however, such a limitation does not appear in the claims as presently drafted. The combination of Hughes in view of Henry clearly teaches the claims as presently drafted.